

**Appln No. 09/900,224**  
**Amdt date December 14, 2004**  
**Reply to Office action of September 14, 2004**

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Office action dated September 14, 2005 claims 1 - 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant has amended claims 1 - 3, 6 - 9 and hereby requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application.

All of the claims were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Gupta, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,389,532 (hereafter "Gupta"). Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claims 1 and 7 are now allowable over Gupta.

Claim 1 recites, in part: "transforming by the first device a portion of the control signal with the parameter signal to generate an encrypted parameter signal and control signal; and generating by the second device a destination parameter signal using the control signal and the encrypted parameter signal and control signal."

Accordingly, claim 1 relates to a method that may be used to securely transfer data (e.g., a parameter signal) and control information (e.g., a control signal) from one device to another. The first device encrypts the data and control information and sends the encrypted result along with control information (e.g., a control signal) to the second device. The second device may then generate the desired data (e.g., a destination parameter signal) using the encrypted result and the control information. In addition, provisions may be made to ensure that the received control information is valid since it may be checked against the encrypted control information (see, e.g., claim 6).

**Appln No. 09/900,224**

**Amdt date December 14, 2004**

**Reply to Office action of September 14, 2004**

In contrast, Gupta does not disclose a method of securely sending data. Rather, Gupta is only concerned with verifying that a sender is authorized (e.g., the sender has received a particular private key). Consequently Gupta only encrypts a fingerprint that may be verified by an intermediary in the network (e.g., a router). Applicant notes that the router is not concerned with the data being sent since its function is to ensure that the sender was authorized to send the data. Thus, Gupta does not teach or suggest that the data 304 may advantageously be encrypted. Moreover, Gupta does not teach or suggest that it may be advantageous to encrypt control information as well. Accordingly, Gupta does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 1.

Similarly, claim 7 relates to an apparatus that may securely receive and use a concealed parameter. The apparatus generates the desired data (e.g., a destination parameter signal) using a control signal and an encrypted parameter signal and control signal. Claim 7 recites, in part: "an interface operation logic block operably coupled to the control signal block to generate a destination parameter signal using the control signal and the encrypted parameter signal and control signal."

As discussed above, Gupta does not teach or suggest that the data 304 may advantageously be encrypted. In addition, Gupta does not teach or suggest that it may be advantageous to encrypt control information as well. Accordingly, Gupta does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 7.

**Appn No. 09/900,224**  
**Amdt date December 14, 2004**  
**Reply to Office action of September 14, 2004**

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 7 are not anticipated by or obvious in view of Gupta. Claims 2 - 6 and 8 - 10 that depend on claims 1 and 7 also are patentable over the cited references for the reasons set forth above. In addition, these dependent claims are patentable over these references for the additional limitations that these claims contain.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited references and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By   
Stephen D. Burbach  
Reg. No. 40,285  
626/795-9900

SDB/cah  
CAH PAS598640.1--12/14/04 3:39 PM